RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAR 07 2007

DORSEY
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

FAX COVER SHEET

DATE:	**March 7, 2007**	TOTAL # OF PAGES: (INCLUDING THIS COVER SHEET)	**2**
TO:	**Examiner Chun-Kuan (Mike) Lee**	FAX #:	**(571) 273-8300**
FIRM NAME:	**United States Patent and Trademark Office**	PHONE #:	
FROM:	**Edward W. Bulchis**	FAX #:	**(206) 903-8820**
PHONE #:	**(206) 903-8785**	EMAIL:	**bulchis.ed@dorsey.com**

COMMENTS:

Please see the attached Interview Agenda for March 21, 2007 for Serial No. 10/804,608.

ORIGINAL WILL BE SENT VIA:		MAIL		E-MAIL		MESSENGER		AIR COURIER	X	WILL NOT BE SENT

PLEASE CONTACT JENNIFER A. STEELE AT (206) 903-8832 IF THIS TRANSMISSION IS INCOMPLETE OR CANNOT BE READ.

REFERENCE # 446602-2023 (Dkt No. 501315.01)

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP · WWW.DORSEY.COM · T 206.903.8800 · F 206.903.8820
U.S. BANK CENTRE · 1420 FIFTH AVENUE · SUITE 3400 · SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98101-4010
USA CANADA EUROPE ASIA

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
MAR 0 7 2007

INTERVIEW AGENDA

Application No. 10/804,608
Examiner Chun-Kuan (Mike) Lee
Edward W. Bulchis
(206) 903-8785
March 21, 2007

1. General discussion of subject matter being claimed in the application
2. Detailed discussion of claimed "data organization system" that organizes data into lane groups in a manner that causes all of the lane groups to be filled
3. Discussion to confirm applicant's understanding that the Examiner has conceded Applicant's admitted prior art does not disclose organizing data in lane groups that are filled with either command header bits or data bits
    - Discussion of how applicant's admitted prior art illustrates the problem of vacant lane groups
4. Discussion of whether the Caldara *et al.* patent discloses organizing command header and data into lanes, each of which is filled with either a command header bit or a data bit
5. Discussion of how the Caldara *et al.* system optimizes bandwidth
    - Discussion of whether the Caldara *et al.* patent discloses optimizing bandwidth using the specific technique described and claimed by applicant
6. Discussion of how present claim language patentably distinguishes over prior art
7. If the Examiner does not believe present claim language is sufficient, discussion of what claim language would satisfy the Examiner to make claims are patentable over prior art